

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS
LOK SABHA**

STARRED QUESTION NO:101
ANSWERED ON:30.07.2001
COST SHARING OF PROJECTS UNDER NRCP
T.M. SELVAGANAPATHI

Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the States are likely to bear 30 percent of the cost of projects to be undertaken in future under the National River Conservation Plan (NRCP) as against the current practice of bearing the entire expenditure by the Union Government;
- (b) if so, the details thereof and reasons therefor;
- (c) the number of projects approved and implemented so far in this regard;
- (d) whether the Union Government have undertaken a review of the projects approved so far; and
- (e) if so, the outcome thereof?

Answer

MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT & FORESTS (SHRI T. R. BAALU)

- (a) to (e) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement in respect of parts (a) to (e) of reply to Lok Sabha Starred Question No.101 to be answered on 30.07.2001 regarding Cost sharing of Projects under NRCP.

(a) & (b) At the Xth Meeting of the National River Conservation Authority (NRCA) held on 13th March 2001 under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister and where Chief Ministers were also present, it was decided after detailed discussions that the cost of works shall be shared between Central and States/local bodies/public on 70:30 basis. The public shall contribute not less than 10% of the cost as it was felt that sustainability of such a programme can be improved with public participation in the river action plans. In fact most of the problems concerning sustainability of the programme are expected to be resolved as a detailed plan for recovery of operation and maintenance cost shall become part of the project proposal in future. An important consideration here was that the participating States feel their responsibility and involvement in making this programme a success. In the above context a holistic and integrated approach shall be adopted for all future works by addressing not only river pollution but other components like internal sewerage, solid waste disposal, low cost toilets etc.

(c) One project at an estimated cost of Rs.14.97 crore has been approved recently in Punjab with the new funding pattern of 70:30. The project covers pollution abatement works in two towns namely, Kapurthala and Sultanpur Lodi located on the banks of a major tributary of river Satluj namely, West Bein. The project is under implementation.

However, prior to the decision of the NRCA the Government had in February 2001 under the National River Conservation Programme sanctioned pollution abatement schemes relating to seven towns of Tamil Nadu namely, Karur, Kumbakonam, Myladuthurai, Thanjavur, Madurai, Thirunelveli and Tiruchirappalli at an estimated cost of Rs.575.50 crore. The share of the Government of India was limited to Rs.282.15 crore while the balance amount of Rs.293.15 crore which also includes the cost of land wherever applicable was to be shared between the State Government (Rs.125.95 crore), local bodies (Rs.117.70 crore), and public/local elected representatives (Rs.49.50 crore).

(d)&(e) The progress and implementation of the Ganga Action Plan and the National River Conservation Plan are reviewed regularly at various levels. At the apex level, the programmes are reviewed by the National River Conservation Authority under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister and the Standing Committee of the NRCA chaired by the Minister of Environment and Forests. A Monitoring Committee under Member, Planning Commission and a Steering Committee under Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests review the Programmes quarterly.

In April 1995 a mid-term evaluation of the Ganga Action Plan Phase I was undertaken jointly by a team consisting of representatives of the Aligarh Muslim University, Roorkee University, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur and the All India Institute of Hygiene and Public Health, Calcutta. In January 1998 a cost benefit analysis of the Ganga Action Plan Phase I was undertaken by team consisting of representatives from Macroeconomica, UK, and some Indian Institutes viz. Institute of Economic Growth, New Delhi, Indian Toxicology Research Centre, Lucknow and All India Institute of Hygiene and Public Health, Calcutta.

There have been problems of operation and maintenance of assets created under the programme. These include non-availability of continuous supply of quality electricity for running the assets and of timely funds. There has been discernable improvement in quality of water over the pre-GAP period. For instance in 1986 the bio-chemical oxygen demand (BOD) which is an indicator of pollution of river water quality ranged from 5.5 to 15.5 mg./l in the critical stretch of Ganga from Kannauj to Varanasi. As against this, the values of BOD in 1999 in this stretch ranged from 1.8 to 6.5 mg./l. Similarly, the dissolved oxygen (DO) levels which indicate the health of the river, was in the range of 5.6. to 7.2. mg./l in 1986 in this stretch and in 1999 the range improved to 6.8 to 8.8 mg./l.